# CATALOGUE

# V. Early Danish and South-East European Inscriptions from ca. 150-650 AD

## 1. Introduction.

*Det var engang et Europa, hvor tre slags samfund indgik et partnerskab: I syd skabtes et imperium, som forfaldt; i nord forvandlade imperiets gaver simple samfund til kongedømmer; og til slut opstod en sammenhæng mellem magt og jordejerskab, fra hvilken fremtiden skulle rejse sig* (Klavs Randsborg 1988:9).

This chapter deals with the greater part of the oldest known runic inscriptions, largely found on Danish territory (comprising present Denmark, Skåne and Blekinge) and dating from the first centuries of our era. The word 'Danish' is merely used here as a geographical term; a coherent Danish state did not yet exist in the early centuries AD.

The oldest known runic attestations were not only found in Denmark; one of the oldest items from outside Denmark is the Norwegian ØVRE STABU spearhead of the Vennolum-type (see Chapter III, 4 and further), dated to the second half of the second century. The runes read **raunijaz** (nsm. *ja*-stem 'tester'). The spearhead was found in a cremation grave in a barrow. Other gravegifts were a sword with a figure of Victoria on it, and weapons similar to those found in the Vimose bog (Haavaldsen 1991:23,45). The runes are carved in tremolo-style. Another second century spearhead with a runic legend has been found in a grave on the island of Gotland: MOS, reading **gaois** (no interpretation). Other runic spearheads (found on the Continent) from around 200 AD are discussed in Chapter II, 7.

Since the provenance of the Thorsberg finds (*circa* 200 AD) appears to be the region between the lower Elbe and Rhine, it seemed more appropriate to me to incorporate these items in the Continental Corpus (see there, nrs. 42, 43).

From South-East Europe some runic objects from the third, fourth and fifth centuries have been recorded, which can be connected with Gothic tribes that settled in the coastal area of the Black Sea at the beginning of the third century AD. I have listed three possibly 'Gothic' inscriptions as a supplement to this chapter. The fourth may be the lancehead from KOWEL, with the legend **tilarids**. Because of its nominative ending -s it is considered Gothic. I have not been able to inspect this item. For elaborate information about the type of spearhead I refer to Hachmann (1993:373ff.), furtheron see Krause (1966:77ff.) who interpreted either "Hinreiter" or "Zielrat". Antonsen (1975:74) interpreted **tilarids** as "Goal-pursuer".

The fact that few runic objects have come to light in South-East Europe may be attributed to several circumstances, such as grave-robbery on a large scale and corrosion of the soil. Runic knowledge among the Goths, if there was any, was most likely tied to Scandinavia, because the Goths originated from there, and because there were continuous contacts between Denmark and the Black Sea region in which the Goths had settled. Besides, the use of the single-barred **h** may point to the Scandinavian runic tradition rather than to the Continental, although the 'Gothic' attestations precede the inscriptions that exhibit double-barred **h**.

It appears to be characteristic of one part of the early 'Danish' inscriptions to be found on objects that were deposited in lakes and bogs, which eventually turned into the present-day peat-layer. The objects can be associated with a warrior class. Another category of runic objects has been found in the graves of rich women. Some precious objects were stray finds,

perhaps belonging to former hoards. Since these ways of depositing are typical of the Danish runic objects, I regard it as useful to list them according to their find circumstances: bog/peat finds, gravefinds, stray finds; all in alphabetical order. Exceptions in more than one way are the Blekinge stones.

Both in runological and historical terms, the runic objects found in Danish regions belong to the oldest recorded runological items; they have been described and commented on by numerous scholars. Handbooks that still prove their qualities are Jacobsen/Moltke 1941/42, Krause/Jankuhn 1966, Moltke 1985. Most recently, Birkmann 1995 edited a useful survey with elaborate references. Over the past few years many articles on new finds have been published by Marie Stoklund and a number of other scholars. Especially the finds from the Illerup-bog have profoundly stirred the runological world. The inscriptions exhibited mirror-runes, which initially looked unintelligible. Mirror-runes were identified as such by virtue of the **alu** stamps of Spong Hill (England, cf. Pieper 1987). After this eye-opener, the legends of the Illerup finds could be properly interpreted. Other peculiarities are runes made in tremolo-style (e.g. Øvre Stabu, Næsbjerg and Donzdorf [Germany]), which is basically a decoration style for metal objects. Further there are some rune sequences that might have had a magical purpose, a practice that can be found also, and perhaps especially, in bracteate legends.

Several useful and updated articles on the early Danish inscriptions, illustrated with high-quality photographs, have been published by Marie Stoklund (1994, 1995[a&b]). As regards the backgrounds of the Illerup bog finds, I rely on the exhaustive presentation and description of the archaeological context by Ilkjær (1990, 1993 and 1996[a&b]). In *Runische Schriftkultur* (ed. Düwel 1994) both Stoklund and Seebold discuss several early runic finds from Denmark; in the same volume, Lena Peterson (1994[b]) discusses especially the names. In my survey I shall try to integrate their opinions.

All Illerup finds are at the Museum Moesgård, Højbjerg, near Århus. The Thorsberg and Meldorf finds are in the Museum Gottorf, Schleswig, Schleswig-Holstein. The Vimose, Nydam, Himlingøye, Udby, Værløse, Kragehul, Garbølle, Strårup, Næsbjerg, Køng and Slemminge finds are in the Danish National Museum at Copenhagen. The Gårdlösa brooch and the Istaby stone are at Statens Historiska Museum Stockholm. The Lindholm bone piece is at the Museum Kulturen Lund, the Nøvling brooch is at the Ålborg Museum, North Jutland. The Leţcani spindle whorl is at the Palatul Cultural, Iaşi, Rumania. The remains of the Pietroassa gold neckring are at the Rumanian National Historical Museum in Bucarest. The Szabadbattyán buckle is at the Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum in Budapest. The Stentoften stone is in the church of Sölvesborg, Blekinge, South Sweden and the Björketorp stone is *in situ*, near Ronneby in Blekinge, South Sweden.

*Map 4. Findspots of early runic objects in Denmark.*

16

1 2 3
4 5 26
28 29

18

33

8 9
10
11 12
34

19

21 13 38
38 40 41

14
15

25

20
30

31

32

17

24

27

23

# 2. CHECKLIST OF EARLY DANISH AND SOUTH-EAST EUROPEAN RUNIC INSCRIPTIONS

*PERIOD I, legible and (partly) interpretable inscriptions.*

BOG-FINDS CA. 160-350 AD

1. *Illerup* I (Jutland), mount for a shield-handle, bronze. The runes read **swarta**. The last rune: **a** is written horizontally under **swart**.

ᛊᚹᚨᚱᛏ
⟋⟋

PN nsm. *a*-stem, Gmc *\*swartaz* 'Black One'. *Blacky* seems to me a suitable name for a weaponsmith, but an owner's name is equally possible. Seebold (1994[a]:70) takes it as an accusative of the strong form of the adj. 'black'[56], and he proposes to emend the legend by extending it with a supposed form of the verb 'to protect', thus getting '(protect the) Black One'. According to Seebold, this would be in analogy with *Illerup* III, below, **laguþewa**, which, considering its ending, might be an accusative of a strong masculine noun. However, a nominative (or appellative) is more plausible, see below. Both names **swarta** and **laguþewa** show West Gmc forms, with loss of final *\*-z* (see also Syrett 1994:141). The same seems to apply for **harja**, see below, nr. 12.

2. *Illerup* II (Jutland), mount for a shield-handle, silver, runes run left, **niþijo tawide**.

ᛏᚹᛁᚦᛁᛏ ᛜᛟᛁᚦᛁᛏ

At first sight, **niþijo** looks like a female PN, nsf. *jō*-stem, but since weapons are commonly associated with a man's world, *Niþijō* assumingly is a man's name and the text a maker's formula, because of the combination with **tawide** 'did, made'. As regards the name, there are two possibilities: a) it is a West Gmc man's name, *n*-stem < IE *\*-ōn*, or *\*-ō* (Krause 1971:51; Stoklund 1987:292); b) it is an epithet or nickname of feminine gender. The first option is preferred, because "it combines masculine reference with masculine gender" (Nielsen 1993:91, with a lengthy discussion on the gender of the suffix -**ijo** in **niþijo** and **wagnijo**). *Niþ-* may be connected with ON *niðr*, Go. *niþjis* 'relative, member of the clan', or with Gmc *\*nīþa-* "Kampf, Streit" (Seebold 1994[a]:69). I associate the name with the tribe of the Nidenses, who lived in Tacitus' time near the rivers Nida and Main (Germany). The ending -*ijo* appears to be West Gmc, and to occur especially often in man's names in the region of the Ubii (see chapter III, On the Origin of the Runes).

---

[56] If so, one would expect a form like *\*swartana*, therefore I don't consider it likely to have a strong adj. in the accusative here.

**tawide** 3 sg. pret. ind. *tawidē* 'did, made', cf. Go. inf. *taujan* 'to do, make'. **tawide** is also on *Garbølle*, **tawido** is on *Gallehus*.

3. *Illerup* III (Jutland), mount for a shield-handle, silver, runes run left, **laguþewa**.

ᛚᚨᚷᚢᚦᛖᚹᚨ

I consider this a masculine PN, consisting of two name-elements, the first: *lagu-* 'sea, water' *u*-stem, cf. ON *lǫgr* 'liquidity' m., and OE, OS *lagu* 'sea, water', Gmc *\*laguz*. An association with ON *lǫg*, OE *lagu* 'law', an *a*-stem, must shatter because of the composition vowel *-u-*. The second element is *-þewa*, which at first sight looks like an accusative of Gmc *\*þegwaz* 'servant', nsm. *wa*-stem. However, an accusative without any other contextual support does not make sense. A nominative or appellative seems more obvious. When compared to *ow-lþuþewaz* on the *Thorsberg* chape, it appears that the nominative marker *-z*, common to North Gmc forms, is missing. Therefore I suggest **laguþewa** to be a West Gmc form. Several proposals are made concerning the missing *-z*; Antonsen (1987:24) interpreted the name as West Gmc, Moltke (1985:101) thought the *-z* had just been forgotten to write, Nielsen (1993:86, 93) proposed the possibility of a weak form and Seebold considers it as an accusative form. A fact is, that there was enough room to cut the **z** rune. A West Gmc name form seems obvious, in coherence with *Swarta, Niþijo* and *Wagnijo* (see below). **laguþewa** means 'Seaservant', e.g. a sailor. It is most probably the name of the owner of an exceptionally beautiful shield that was found in the Illerup bog and to which the handle belonged. According to Ilkjær (1996[b]:485) he was an important commander-in-chief.

4. *Illerup* IV (Jutland), two iron lanceheads; the runes run left, **wagnijo**.

ᚹᚨᚷᚾᛁᛃᛟ

The legend is stamped on one and incised on the other. The lanceheads are of Illerup Type 15, called "Vennolum" (Ilkjær 1990). Over 300 items of this type are found in the Illerup bog. **wagnijo** is probably a West Gmc man's name in the nominative, *n*-stem, cf. **niþijo** nr. 2. *Wagnijo* may be connected with either ON *vagn* 'waggon', or the tribe's name of the *Vangiones*, cf. the cognomen *Vangio* in CIL VI 31149, c 5, and the Suebian chief *Vangio* (Schönfeld 1965:256f.), and the *cohors Vangionum*, Tacitus, *Annales* xii, 27. Since the name is recorded from three lanceheads (a third was found in the Vimose bog, see below, nr. 8), I regard it as the name of a weaponsmith, who originated from the region south of nowadays Frankfurt am Main (Germany), the area in which the *Vangiones* lived (see map 3). Seebold (1994[a]:68) regards **wagnijo** as a weapon-name, denoting a group of weapons, maybe in a religious sense. (About the problems of the nominative sg. of masculine *a*- and *n*-stems, see Syrett 1994:45 and 137ff.).

5. *Illerup* V (Jutland), wooden handle for a fire iron; the runes read **gauþz**.

ᚷᚨᚢᚦᛉ

The **þ**-rune has a big loop from top to bottom, so that it looks like a Roman D. A similar sign is on the MELDORF brooch. **gauþz** might denote a PN or epithet, possibly nsm. *a/i*-stem, with the nominative ending *-z* present, but the stem-formant missing, which may indicate an occurrence of syncope or the presence of an unknown root-stem. If *gauþz* is related to Gmc *\*gautaz*, it might be connected with ON *gautr* 'someone who was dedicated to be offered to a god = Odin' (one of Odin's many names was Gautr), or one belonging to the tribe of the Gautar, OE *Gēatas*. The *Gautar* lived in the region that nowadays is called Östergötland and Västergötland (Sweden). Schönfeld (1965:103) lists *Gapt* PN (king of the Goths), and explains: *Gapt = \*Gaft = \*Gaut* by interference of Greek writing: *Gavt*. He states that *Gapt =* Go. *\*Gauts*, ON *Gautr*, OE *Gēat*. Förstemann lists *Gautr* as the mythical ancestor of the tribe of the Goths. Stoklund (1992:256) and Seebold (1994[a]:71) connect **gauþ**[a]**z** with the ON verb *geyja* (< Gmc *\*gaujan*) 'to bark, to mock' and the ON substantive *gauđ* f. 'barking, mocking'.

6. *Nydam* I (Jutland), wooden axe-handle, found in 1993. Date: ca. 300-350 AD. Runes on both sides; running right is **wagagastiz**, running left is **alu:??hgusikijaz:aiþalataz**. (See Stoklund 1994[a]:104 and 1994[b]:4-5 with ref.). Stoklund (1994[a]:104) proposes to read thus: **alu:*wi*hgu sikijaz:aiþalataz**.

ᚹᚨᚷᚨᚷᛊᛏᛁᛉ   ᛃᛚᛏᛏᛏᛞᛁᛉᛃᛁᚦᛁᛊᛚᚷᚺᛁᛃᛚᛏᛏ

**wagagastiz** is probably a PN. The first part, *wāga-*, may be connected with ON *vágr*, m. 'wave', or, in a poetic sense 'flame'. Second element is *-gastiz*, nsm. *i*-stem, 'guest'. Since the axe itself (not preserved) might have been made of bog-iron ore, the depiction **wagagastiz** 'flameguest' or 'fireguest' would be appropriate when taken in connection with the meaning of **sikijaz** 'coming from a bog'. On the other hand, a 'waveguest' and the object, an axe, might point to a means of gaining divine knowledge, which went by consultation of the waves, such as is referred to in Norse and Irish sources. One waded into the sea and thrusted the axe at the waves, and some significant sign would happen (Ellis Davidson 1988:151f.).
**alu** is generally considered a formulaic word with some cultic connotation, or a well-wish (more about **alu** in the chapter on Bracteates).
**wihgu** strikes as an intertwined verbform, perhaps rendering either of two meanings, a) *wīgu* 1 sg. pres. ind. 'I fight', cf. Gmc *\*wīgan* 'to fight'; or b) *wīhiju* 1 sg. pres. ind. 'I hallow, consecrate', cf. Gmc *\*wīhjan* 'to hallow'. Both interpretations might agree, for an axe was a weapon and had a sacrificial connotation. **sikijaz** PN, nsm. *ja*-stem; ON *sīk* (Modern Danish *sig*) 'small bog, swamp'; the suffix **-ijaz** indicates descent: 'coming from a bog', cf. *Gallehus* **holtijaz** 'coming from (the place) Holt'. **aiþalataz** may be a PN or an epithet, consisting of *aiþa-* 'oath', cf. Gmc *\*aiþaz*, Go *aiþs*, ON *eiđr*; and *-lātaz*, nsm. *a*-stem, 'sayer', cf. Gmc *\*lētan* 'to let, to allow, to leave behind', ON *láta* 'say, declare'. Weapons were used to take one's oath, according to the Eddic Havamál. The text may be 'Flameguest, coming from a bog, **alu**, I, oathsayer, consecrate/fight'. If the reference to the iron axe, made of smelted bog-iron, is correct, this would place this text among a wide-spread type of runic texts, naming the object or the material (see below, *Leţcani*, nr. 36).

7. *Nydam* II (Jutland), a bronze strap end ("den ene af bronze-rembøjlens to spidser"), dated *circa* 250-320. The rune-inscribed strap end belonged to a rich sword sheath of leather and wood with a gilt-silver scabbard mount and sword-chape (Stoklund, personal commu-

nication). The runes read from right to left,  **harkilaz ahti**.

ᛁᛏᚺᛁ·ᛉᛁᛁᚦ�ᚺ

**harkilaz** is most probably a PN, nsm. *a*-stem *Harkilaz*. The name might initially have been an *n*-stem, if the first part of the name were *Harki-* (maybe connected with ON *harkr* 'uprour, tumult'), followed by the diminutive suffix *-ilan-* such as in **frohila** and **niuwila** on the *Darum* (I)-B and (V)-C bracteates (nrs 7 and 8 in this edition). Since we have a strong form *Harkilaz* here, I suggest a case of analogy with strong masculine *a*-stem names, otherwise very popular. The meaning of the name may be something like 'Little squirt', a petname probably.

**ahti** seems to indicate a 3 sg. pret. ind. of *\*aigan* 'to have', but a meaning 'Harkilaz had (this)' seems inappropriate. I take it to mean 'possession'; cf. Seebold (1970:70), who lists *\*aih-ti-z* f. 'possession'. A problem is that the name is in the nominative, whereas a genitive would be more suitable. An ownership-expression, though, includes the inscription in a wide-spread type of texts.

8. *Vimose* I (Funen), iron lancehead of the same type as the Illerup ones; the runes also run left, **wagnijo**.
Cf. nr. 4.

ᛉᛋᛁᛏᚷᛁᛈ

9. *Vimose* II (Funen), sword-chape, bronze, the runes read  **mariha  aala   makija**. The part **aala** runs from right to left.

ᛗᚠᚱᛁᚺᚠ  ᛁᛁᛁᛒ  ᛗᚠᚲᛁᛋᚠ

On one side of the chape is **mariha**; when turning the object halfway round, the inscription proceeds on the same side with **aala**. The initial **a** is a *Sturzrune* (upside-down rune) in my opinion, but most runologists read **i**. On the other side of the object is **makija**. Antonsen's reading (1975:32) **marida** cannot be right, as there is quite clearly an **h** and no **d**. In the sequence **mariha** one might distinguish two parts: **mari   ha**. The first part might be a shortened name, either for the sword or the owner: *māri < \*māriz*, nsm. *i*-stem, 'famous' cf. **niwajemariz** of the *Thorsberg* chape (Continental Corpus). However, I suggest to interpret **mari** as 'sea, water', cf. Gmc *\*mariz*, ON *marr* 'lake, sea', OS, OHG *meri*, OE, OFris *mere* 'lake, moor'. This would be fitting, since the object was found in a former lake, and was probably part of a deposit of war booty. **ha** may be opt. sg. *\*ha(bē)* of the verb *\*habēn* (> ON *hafa* 'to have, possess'). **aala** adj. cf. the ON prefix *al-* 'all'. A double *aa* in *aala* is not strange, as we have, also from *Vimose*, **aadagasu** (see below).

**makija** asm. *ja*-stem *mākija* 'sword'.

The meaning of the text would be: 'may the lake have all - sword'. If 'all' refers to all weapons that were deposited in the bog, the singular **makija** 'sword' could be regarded as *pars pro toto* for all those swords. Thus it would become clear why among so many similar objects, deposited all together, only one has been inscribed.

10. *Vimose* III (Funen), buckle, bronze, the runes read **aadagasu |laasauwija**

ᚠᚨᛗᚷᚨᛋᚢ    ᛚᚨᚨᛋᚨᚢᚹᛁᛃᚨ

Antonsen (1975:75) read **aadagast**. After autopsion of the inscription I think there may be **u** at the end, certainly no **t**. I propose to divide the inscription thus: **aadag asu laas auwija**.
**aadag** might be a PN, *A(n)dag(az)* nsm. *a*-stem, stem formant and ending *-z* missing, which is problematic in this early phase of the language (one may compare the equally endingless **alugod** *Værløse*, nr. 18). This is probably the reason why philologists take the first runes (partly) as symbolic runes. Seebold (1994ª:64f.) proposed to read:  **a a[n]da g** "Ase Hingabe" and Krause (1966: 57ff. and 1971:174) transliterated:  **a[nsus] a[n]dag a[n]sula a[n]sau wīja** "Ase! Den Andag weihe ich, der kleine Ase, dem Asen (Wodan)".
I prefer the attested name *A(n)dag* (Förstemann 1966:102 and Reichert 1987:49). The first element is *and-*, cf. OS, OHG *ando, anto* 'zeal'; or Gmc *\*and(a)-* 'across, opposite'; or Gmc *\*andja-*, Go. *andeis* '(head)-end', 'high purpose' (Kaufmann 1968:34). Second element is *-dag*, Gmc *\*dagaz*, nsm. *a*-stem 'day'.
The following I take as a compound of **asu-**, *\*a(n)su-*, *u*-stem 'god', and **-laas** = *-laus,* cf. Gmc *\*lausaz* adj. *a*-stem, 'without', cf. *Björketorp*: **herAmAlAs** 'shameless' and Skírnismál 31 *verlaus* 'without a man'. **auwija** = *auja*, showing in *-uw-* the result of the West Gmc gemination of *-w-* before *-j* (Antonsen 1987:23), cf. also *Oettingen* **auwijabrg** (Continental Corpus). *auja* is generally considered to be a formulaic word, nsm. *n*-stem, maybe meaning 'luck' or 'protection' (see chapter on Bracteates). In my opinion we may read: *A(a)dag asula(a)s auwija* 'Aadag the godless, *auwija*'; 'godless' taken as an epithet. Note, that there is alliteration. From the point of view concerning the use of Latin in runic inscriptions, Seebold (1994ª:64) proposes an interesting interpretation of the part **asu la**, which he compares with Lat. *ansula, ansa* 'ring, handle, haft' which may refer to the object, the buckle, cf. ON *æs* f. < Gmc *\*ansiō* 'hole for a cord or braid'.

11. *Vimose* IV (Funen), plane, wood, the runes read
**talijo gisaioj:wilizailao???    t??is:hleuno:an?:regu**

ᛏᚨᛚᛁᛃᛟ    ᚷᛁᛊᚨᛁᛟᛃ⠇ᚹᛁᛚᛁᛃᚨᛁᛚᚨᛟ    ᛏ ᛒ⠇ᚻᛚᛖᚢᚾᛟ⠇ᚨᚾ ⠇ᚱᛖᚷᚢ

**talijo** should probably be read as *tal(g)ijo*, nsf. *ōn*-stem (Krause 1971:173), meaning 'plane'; if **gisaioj** is a misspelling for *gisaijō/o*, it might be a PN, nsf. *ōn*-stem or nsm. *n*-stem (cf. **wagnijo** and **niþijo**). A masculine owner's name would be suitable, since a plane was used to sharpen points to wooden spears (Ilkjær 1996ᵇ:480). The first element is well-known: *gīsa-*, cf. *\*gīsalaz* 'hostage' or *\*gīsa* 'sprout, offspring' (Kaufmann 1965:94). **hleuno** nsf. *ōn*-stem 'protection' (cf. Krause, 1971:173). **regu** may be associated with a verbform, 1 sg. pres. ind., or it is the acc. sg. of a *u*-stem, or acc pl. of a neutrum. The second rune of the second part has been read as ᛋ **k** (Moltke 1985:87ff.), but according to Stoklund (1994ª:102) this seems to make no sense. Seebold (1994ª:67) takes the sequence as **tibi[n]s** and connects this with OHG *zebar*, OE *tiber* 'offering'. Stoklund and Seebold are both of the opinion that the inscription is made by two different hands. The second part would be a "Weihinschrift" (because it was part of a ritual deposit) and reckoned to be 'Danish'; the first is a "Herkunftinschrift" and is

labelled 'Scandinavian' = South Sweden (Seebold 1994[a]:68, 70). He interprets: "die Opfergaben dem geschützten Ort widme ich" and "Hobel. Dem G. Odal Jahr". I am of the opinion that the inscription displays too many runological uncertainties, hence an interpretation seems not possible.

12. *Vimose* V (Funen), comb, bone, the runes read **harja**

ᚺᚨᚱᛃᚨ

The comb is dated by Ilkjær (1993:297-299) to ca. 160 AD, which makes it about the oldest known runic inscription, together with the Norwegian spearhead of ØVRE STABU (MELDORF not included, see Continental Corpus, the introduction). The inscription may be a PN or epithet, *harja*, nsm. *ja*-stem, Gmc *\*harjaz* 'warrior', cf. Go. *harjis*. Seebold (1994[a]:71) suggests a connection with 'hair', Proto Norse *\*hāra*. The comb may be used for combing wool, which was also done by men. Peterson (1994[b]:161) lists the name **harja** under the heading "Group IV. Names not met with in later Scandinavian but found in West Gmc, esp. in the Lower Rhine region". She compares **harja** with OFranc *Herio*. However, Schönfeld lists the *Harii* as a tribal name, belonging to the larger tribes' alliance of the *Lugii*, as is mentioned by Tacitus (Germania § 43; see for references Much 1959:378,390). There is one other inscription that is of great interest in this context, i.c. the SKÅÄNG stone from Sweden, with runes reading **harijaz leugaz**, mentioning both *Harii* and *Lugii*, see chapter III 'Origin'. I suggest **harja** to refer to a member of the tribe of the *Harii*.

GRAVEFINDS CA. 200-300 AD

13. *Gårdlösa* (Skåne), stirrup fibula, silver, the runes read **ekunwodz**

ᛖᚲᚢᚾᚹᛟᛞᛉ

ek person pron. 1 sg. 'I'. **unwodz** may be a PN or epithet. *wōdz* is according to Antonsen (1975:31) a root consonant stem, cf. Go. *wōþs*, adj. 'raging', *unwōdz* may be interpreted as 'not raging'. Was the brooch part of a recompensation? Antonsen interprets: 'I, the calm one'. Seebold (1994[a]:63) supposes the inscription might have been made on the occasion of the burial, to prevent the dead woman from "Wiedergängertum". Stoklund (1994[a]:99) declares the occurrence of a PN as disputed. But since it follows the person pronoun *ek* it may very well be a name, most likely a man's name, because of the ending *-z*. A parallel is the *Rasquert* (The Netherlands) inscription, which reads **ek u[n]mædit oka** 'I, Oka, not (made) mad'.

14. *Himlingøje* I (Sealand), rosette fibula, silver, dated 2nd half 3rd c. (Stoklund 1995[b]:318). The runes read **widuhudaz**

ᚹᛁᛞᚢᚺᚢᛞᚨᛉ

This may be a masculine PN, consisting of *widu-*, *u*-stem 'wood', and *-hu(n)daz* nsm. *a*-stem 'hound'. Sign for nasal is missing before homorganic consonant. a common practice in runic

script. *widuhu(n)daz* 'woodhound' = wolf. Stoklund warns that some runes preceding **w** may be missing, and that the nature of a name 'Woodhound' is disputed. Makaev (1996:63) points to the fact that names with a second element *-hundaz* are attested in OHG sources, but completely unknown in Scandinavia.

15. *Himlingøje* II (Sealand), bow fibula, silver, the runes read **hariso**

ᚺᚨᚱᛁᛋᛟ

This is probably a PN, nsm. *n*-stem, or nsf. *ōn*-stem, *Harisō* (cf. Antonsen 1975:35 and Peterson 1994[b]:157f.). Stoklund (1994:98) points to the fact that it might be a masculine name, in concordance with **wagnijo** and **niþijo** on the *Vimose* and *Illerup* objects, and the recorded name *Flavius Hariso* in a Venetic funerary inscription (cf. Peterson 1994[b]:157f., who discusses the name at great length and supposes that it might be a continental import). Also Seebold (1994[a]:75) considers the name to be masculine. Considering the fact, that Himlingøje was an exceptionally rich gravefield, I wonder whether *hārisō* may be a compound name of a distinguished woman. The name may consist of *hār-*, Gmc *\*haira-*, 'grey, lofty, distinguished', and *-isō*, showing the well-known *-s-* suffix in personal names, cf. *Beuchte* (German Corpus) *Burisō*, which is considered to be a PN nsf. *ōn*-stem. On the other hand, there is the Frankish masculine PN *Hrōdso*, Gmc *\*Hrōþiso* with an *s*-suffix as *Koseform*, which was "besonders beliebt im Westfränkischen", according to Kaufmann (1965-:246). The suffix was not only common in West Franconian, but in all West Gmc languages (cf. also Peterson 1994[b]:158). Thus, names ending in *-iso* (including *Buriso* and *Hariso*) may be West Gmc men's names.
As to *Hariso*, one may wonder, whether this name is connected too with the tribal name of the *Harii*, as appears to be the case with the *Vimose* comb, nr. 12.

16. *Nøvling* (Jutland), rosette fibula, silver, the runes read
**bidawarijaztalgidai**

ᛒᛁᛞᚨᚹᚨᚱᛁᛃᚨᛉ ᛏᚨᛚᚷᛁᛞᚨᛁ

**bidawarijaz** is probably a PN, consisting of *bīda-* 'to long for, to wish', cf. ON *bíða*, Go *beidan*, and *-warijaz* nsm. *ja*-stem, 'protector'. **talgidai** 3 sg. pret. ind. 'carved'. The ending **-ai** has been interpreted as a misspelling or a reverse spelling for *-ē* (Krause 1971:158, Antonsen 1975:5); this is rejected by Stoklund (1991:96 and 1994[a]:98). Seebold (1994[a]:62) regards the ending as an **a** rune followed by an ending sign │. As regards a discussion on the pro's and contra's of the runewriters' spelling skills, see Syrett (1994:252ff.). The spelling error became possible after the shift Gmc *\*ai > ē*. Since there are no word dividing signs, perhaps **talgida i**: 'carved in' might be read, in which case we have a parallel to the verbform in *Udby* (below).

17. *Udby* (Sealand), rosette fibula, silver, the runes read **talgida : lamo**

ᛏᚨᛚᚷᛁᛞᚨ᛬ᛟᛗᛚᛚ

**lamo** is written from right to left, whereas **talgida** has been written from left to right. **lamo**

may be a PN, nsm. *n*-stem, or nsf. *ōn*-stem *Lamō*: 'Lame One'. In case one prefers the female name, one must assume that she made the inscription, which points to the existence of female rune-writers. If *Lamo* is a man's name, it would reflect a West Gmc form, cf. **wagnijo**, **hariso** and **niþijo** (see also Syrett 1994:141ff.).

**talgida** 3 sg. pret. ind. 'carved', cf. ON *telgja* 'to carve, to cut' (cf. Stoklund 1991:95-99). Cf. **talijo** 'plane' *Vimose* IV, nr. 12, and **talgidai** Nøvling, nr. 16. The ending *-da* of the verbform **talgida** might reflect an East Gmc dialect (Stoklund 1994[a]:107). Grønvik (1994:46f.) postulates that **talgida** cannot be a verb form, because of the ending **-da**. He argues that it must be a substantive, nsm. *n*-stem 'carver'. This sounds reasonable enough, but since we may have **talgida i** in *Nøvling* (see above) I would prefer the verb form. The inscription would thus qualify as a common form of a maker's formula. The co-occurrence of a West Gmc name and an East Gmc verbform seems surprising.

18. *Værløse* (Sealand), rosette fibula, silver, the runes read **alugod**

ᚨᛚᚢᚷᛟᛞ

The presence of **alu** suggests that the text may be some well-wish. **alu** is a formulaic word, which occurs relatively often on bracteates (see above, nr. 6). As to the part **god**, this may be an adj. meaning 'good', cf. ON *góðr*. *\*gōð-* often appears as a name-element in both male and female names, cf. **godagas** in VALSFJORD, but is uncommon as second element in a name (Peterson 1994[b]:145 and 163). One may think of ON *goð* < Gmc *\*guða* 'god'. Seebold interprets: 'offering with beer', "Festopfer" (1994[a]:62f.), which, perhaps, points to the pouring of a libation, because of the derivation of ON *goð* < IE *\*ǵheu-* 'to pour' (cf. Kluge/Seebold 1989:273 "Gott", "Ursprünglich also 'Gießen, Opferung', dann übertragen auf den Gott, zu dessen Ehren das Opfer stattfindet"). Stoklund (1994[a]:98) mentions that it is possibly an "Abschreibfehler" for the woman's name *Alugodo*. Antonsen (1975:75f.) prefers a West Gmc man's name without nominative ending. Considering the striking amount of possible West Gmc men's names among the runic attestations found in Denmark, I would also opt for *Alugod* being a West Gmc man's name.

BOG/PEAT-FINDS CA. 400-550 AD

19. *Garbølle* (Stenmagle, Sealand), yew-wooden box, the runes read **hagiradaz|tawide:**

ᚺᚨᚷᛁᚱᚨᛞᚨᛉ⁚ᛏᚨᚹᛁᛞᛖ⁚

The dating is uncertain, according to Stoklund (1994[a]:99f.).

**hagiradaz** is a PN, a compound consisting of *hagi-*, ON *hagr*, adj. 'suitable', and *-rāðaz* 'adviser' nsm. *a*-stam, cf. ON *rāð* n. 'advice'. **tawide** *tawidē* 3 sg. pret. ind. 'made', cf. inf. Go *taujan* 'to do, make'. **tawide** is also on *Illerup* II, above.

20. *Kragehul* I (Funen), spear-shaft, wood, the runes read
**ek<u>eril</u><u>az</u>asugisalas<u>muha</u>hai<u>te</u>ga<u>gaga</u>ginuga** **????** (the runes on the last part are illegible

now).

ᛗᚨᚱᛁᛁ ᚨᚠᛖᚢ ᚷᛁᛖᛏᛏᛖ�ᚺᚺᛁᛏᛗᚷᚷᚷᚷᛁᚺᚷ

The runic text is very elegantly cut in triple strokes alternating with single strokes. **ek** pers. pron. 1 sg. 'I'. **erilaz**, probably an epithet or a title, nsm. *a*-stem, etymology obscure (see Krause 1971:141; Antonsen 1975:36), although Syrett (1994:170, note 12) sees a possibility to connect **erilaz** as a representative of the tribe of the *Heruli* and to represent a more general job or title. Makaev (1996:36ff.) presents an exhaustive treatment of occurrences of **erilaz** etc. and many references. He also thinks a connection with the *Heruli* possible (1996:39)[57]. **asugisalas**, PN, gsm. *a*-stem (see above, nr. 11). It is a compound consisting of *a(n)su-* 'god', and *-gīsalas* 'sprout, shoot, offspring'. **muha** may be either a PN, nsm. *n*-stem, or a substantive, cf. *(ga)mūha* 'retainer' (Krause 1971:152). **haite** 1 sg. pres. med. (Antonsen 1975:36): 'I am called', cf. ON *heiti*, inf. *heita*, Go. *haitan*. Instead of **muha** Antonsen reads: <u>**em uha**</u>; *em* = 1 sg. pres. ind. 'I am', *Uha* = PN nsm. *n*-stem 'the highest'. According to Peterson (1994[b]:-144) "no proof of the existence of a Proto-Scandinavian man's name *Ūha* has come to light". The sequence 'I erilaz of Asugisalaz, I am called Muha' is followed by some sort of battle-cry: *gagaga gin(n)u ga* 'many times *ga*'. The runes of **gagaga** are displayed as a row of three rune-crosses; the base is the rune **g**, with sidetwigs attached to its extremities, thus forming bindrunes **ga**, cf. the <u>*Undley*</u> bracteate (Bracteate Corpus) with nearly the same sequence, reproduced in the same fashion: <u>**gægogæ**</u>.

21. <u>*Lindholm*</u> (Skåne), bonepiece with a possible function as amulet. It was said to be found in a lump of peat (Jacobsen & Moltke 1941/42:315). The runes run left and read **ekerilazsa-wilagazhateka:aaaaaaaazzznnn?bmuttt:alu:**

ᛚᛁᛁᛉᛏᛏᛏᚨᛗᛖ ᚺᚺᚤᚤᚤᛁᛁᛁᛁᛁᛁᛁᛁᛁᚦᚨᛗᛏᚺᚤᛁᚷᛏᛏᛁᛁᛁᛊᚤᛏᛏᛁᚱᛗᚨᛗ

Runes are cut in triple lines, like on <u>*Kragehul*</u>, above. Both inscriptions start with **ek erilaz**. **sawilagaz** is a PN or epithet, perhaps nsm. *a*-stem, cf. Go. *sauil* 'sun' n. *a*-stem, e.g. the name means 'Sunny One' (Antonsen 1975:37). Krause (1971:155) divides thus: **erilaz sa wilagaz**, nsm. *a*-stem; taking **sa** to be a demonstrative pronoun with deictic function, followed by a PN **wilagaz**. He interprets: 'I, the Runemaster here, am called Cunning'; cf. ON *vél* < *wīlu-* 'cunning' (Krause 1971:108). Also Peterson (1994[b]:141) prefers to read the name as *Wīlagaz*. **hateka** = *ha(i)t(e)-eka* with enclitic *-eka* 'I am called'; cf. above, nr. 20 **haite**, inf. *heita* 'to be called'. The sequence **aaaaaaaa** is interpreted as a magical formula; the eight **a** runes would render eight times the **a**-rune's name *\*ansuz*, e.g. eight gods, ON *átta æsir*. Such a charm is known from Icelandic: *rísti eg þér ása átta, nauðir níu* 'I carve for you eight *æsir*, nine needs', by which probably eight times **a** and nine times **n** are meant. The **a** runes are followed by three *\*algiz* runes, perhaps symbolizing something that is expressed by its name 'elk'. Then thrice **n**, perhaps symbolizing its name *nauð* 'need', which may have something to do with the so-called 'needs' (*nauðir*) that appear in medieval recipes and charms and in a 14th-century runic inscription from RIBE. The Eddic poem Sigrdrífomál 7

---

[57] Bracteates <u>*Eskatorp-F*</u> and <u>*Väsby-F*</u> have **e[k]erilaz**. ETELHEM clasp: **mkmrlawrta** (= ek erla wrta), BRATSBERG clasp: **ekerilaz**, VEBLUNGSNES: **ekirilaz**, ROSSELAND: **ekwagigazerilaz**, JÄRSBERG: **ekerilaz**, BY: **ekirilaz**.

advises: *á horni scal þær rísta, oc á handar baki, oc merkia á nagli nauð* 'carve them on the drinkinghorn, on the back of your hand and mark your nail with Need'. Three times **t** probably concerns the rune name *Týr*, the one-handed god, "and leavings of the wolf, and king of temples", according to the Old Norse rune-poem. As to **alu**, see above, nr. 6).

22. *Nydam* III (Jutland), arrow, the runes read **lua**

ᛚᚢᚨ

lua may be a misspelling for **alu**; here perhaps representing a battle cry with magical impact? In 1994 another arrow was found in Nydam, with two leftrunning runes: **la** (Stoklund 1994[b]:6, and Stoklund 1995[b]:344).

23. *Slemminge* (Lolland), reindeer antler, hide-scraper, **witring** or **witro**?

ᚹᛁᛏᚱᛝ

The last sign resembles the so-called lantern-shaped rune, commonly transliterated **(i)ng** (see Chapter III.8). Its presence is meager attested (cf. Barnes 1984:70ff. and Odenstedt 1990:103ff.), and its value disputed. Of the lists published in Barnes 1984 and Odenstedt 1990, the only certain attestations of ᛝ (note the slight difference with ᛝ above) in legible texts (according to my own findings) are in East Europe: *Aquincum, Leţcani, Szabadbattyán*, in Denmark *Køng* (below, nr. 31) and in Frisia *Wijnaldum A* (the latter not in Barnes' and Odenstedt's lists). Furtheron, the rune is present in Tanem (not inspected by me) and some *fuþark*'s. I think its value ambiguous in *Slemminge*. One may read *Witring*, maybe a PN, consisting of the adj. *witr-*, cf. ON *vitr* 'wise', and the suffix *-ing*, used for characterising some special quality. An alternative is to take the ultimate rune for a slightly misshaped **o**, which renders the reading **witro**. This is perhaps a PN, nsf. *ō*-stem *Witrō* , or nsm. *n*-stem *Witro,* 'Wise One'.

Stray finds ca. 400-550 AD

24. *Gallehus* (Jutland), two horns, gold, one with a runic inscription
**ekhlewagastiz|holtijaz|horna|tawido**

ᛖᚲᚺᛚᛖᚹᚨᚷᚨᛊᛏᛁᛉ᛬ᚺᛟᛚᛏᛁᛜᚨᛉ᛬ᚺᛟᚱᚾᚨ᛬ᛏᚨᚹᛁᛞᛟ

Runes are partly cut in double lines (and tremolo-technique? This cannot be checked, since the horn is lost) and partly in single lines. **ek** 1 sg. pers. pron. 'I'. Generally, **hlewagastiz** is considered a PN, a compound consisting of **hlewa-**, cf. Gmc *\*hlewa* 'lee, protection' (Antonsen 1975:41) or *\*hlewa* 'Ruhm' (Krause 1971:148), and **-gastiz**, cf. above *Nydam* I, nr. 6, nsm. *i*-stem. I suggest to interpret the part **hlewa-** otherwise, and read it as *\*hlēwa < hlaiwa*, Go. *hlaiw* 'grave(mound)', also found in the first element of the name of the dwarf *Hlévargr*, which, according to De Vries (1962:237) may consist of *hlé- < hlaiwa* 'grave', and *vargr*. The substantive *hlēwagastiz* may thus mean: 'graveguest'. **hlaiwa** in the meaning 'grave(mound)'

is found on the rune stones of Bø and Kjølevik (both Rogaland, Norway). **holtijaz** may be a patronymic, nsm. *a*-stem 'son of Holt'; or a locative, 'coming from the place Holt'; **tawido** *tawidō* 1 sg. pret. ind. 'did, made'. **horna** asn. *a*-stem 'the horn' (Antonsen 1995:41). Vennemann (1989:355-368) conjectures **horna** to be a rare dualform, acc. 'the two horns'.

25. *Strårup* (Jutland), golden diadem or neckring, the runes read **leþro**

ᛚᛇᚦᚱᛟ

This is probably a PN, nsf. *n*-stem *leþrō* 'Leathery One', perhaps the name of the owner, an old woman? This seems a bit unlikely. It might be West Gmc man's name, nsm. *n*-stem, cf. **wagnijo** and **niþijo**. Another neckring with a runic inscription is *Aalen* (Continental Corpus, nr. 1), exhibiting the legend **noru**.

## 3. Illegible and/or uninterpretable inscriptions.

All Illerup, Vimose and Kragehul finds are bog-finds and dated to 200-250. The gravefinds are dated 200-300.

26. *Illerup VI* (Jutland), circular sword-chape, bronze, surface eroded and damaged (Stoklund 1987:295), **f**-rune reversed, the legend reads **fir?a**.

ᚺᛁᚱ ᚠ

The damaged rune, here transliterated **?** might be **h**. Schönfeld (1965:88) lists the *Firaesi*, and adds that it is the name of a Scandinavian tribe. In view of the derivations of tribal names that appear in the Danish runic Corpus, this inscription might perhaps point to a member of the otherwise unknown *Firaesi*.

27. *Frøslev* (Jutland), stray find (?), wooden stick, runes unclear.

28. *Illerup* VII (Jutland) plane, wood, the runes read **afila???**

ᚠᚹᛁᛚᚨ

Moltke (1985:89f.) and Stoklund tentatively read *afilaiki* but the reading **iki** is far from certain (Stoklund 1987:286).

29. *Illerup* VIII (Jutland), hornfitting, bronze, the runes read **fu??z   fra**

ᚠᚢ   ᛉ   ᚠᚱᚨ

30. *Kragehul* II (Funen),  knifeshaft, bone, runes running left,
**...uma | bera||....?(a)u**.

92

ᛗᛁ    ᛒᛖᚱᚨᛁᛏᚨ

The runes are cut in double strokes. **bera** may be a PN nsm. *n*-stem 'Bear'.

31. *Køng* (Funen), bronze figure, stray find (?), the runes read **(i)ngo**, or, when taking the initial rune as a mirror-rune, one may read **wo** or **þo**.

ᛝᛟ

The initial runeform occurs also in *Leţcani* **ng** (below, nr. 35) and *Wijnaldum A* **(i)ng** (The Netherlands), and, slightly different, in *Slemminge* (above, nr. 23). **(i)ngo** might be (part of) a PN.

32. *Møllegårdsmarken* (Gudme, Funen), iron knife, found in a woman's grave, date *circa* 300 AD. **hth shi(?)o**.

ᚺᛏᚺ    ᛒᚺᛁᛟ

33. *Næsbjerg* (Jutland), rosette fibula, found in a woman's grave, silver. It is conjectured, that **warafnis** or **warawnis** may be read, but actually only **?ara?nis** can be perceived with any certainty.

ᛒᛁᚺᛋᛁᚱᚾ

Runes are cut in tremolo-technique and run from right to left. The upper parts of the runes are rather abraded, therefore any interpretation seems impossible.

34. *Vimose* VI, sheath-mount, rune-imitation? running left, **awurs**? Stoklund (1995:333, with a photo).

ᚲᛏᚢᛇ

4. Gothic or South-East European runic finds

35. *Leţcani* (Moldavia, Rumania). Spindle whorl, found in a woman's grave, Dated second half 4th c. Almost all runes are clearly legible. The runes appear to have been added after the firing. The inscription runs from left to right. The conic form of the object allows to distinguish two parts: one inscription of four runes on the top half and one consisting of nine runes on the lower half.
Krause (1969) proposed the following transliteration (1969:156) **idonsufthe :rango:** and interpreted this as *Idōns uft hē(r). - Raη(n)ō*, "Idos Gewebe (ist das?) hier. - Rangno".
After personal examination of the inscription in 1994 (Looijenga 1996[b]) I established the reading **rango** (or **rawo**) **:adonsufhe**.

# ᚱᚨᚾᚷᛟ  ᚺᛗᛟᛏᛖᚾᚢᚺ ᛗ

The upper part of the initial rune of the second part of the inscription is damaged. The rune shows a headstaff and one sidetwig to the right ᚨ ; the other sidetwig of presumably an **a** rune has gone lost.

*The Leţcani spindle whorl showing the runes f, h and the anomalous e.*

The rune ᛜ is mostly transliterated **(i)ng**, here I propose to transliterate **ng**. It may, on the other hand, be taken as a mirror-rune representing **w** (cf. the *Illerup* inscriptions nrs. 3 and 4, with a similar rune for **w**), then the reading **rawo**[58] is possible.

The last two runes of the lower half had to be pressed close together. An **h** with one bar is followed by **e** or **m**. The runes are connected by a slanting stroke of which it is unclear whether it is a deliberate stroke and part of the inscription, or whether it is just a scratch, a damage. If the stroke should be taken as a third runic sign, the sequence may be taken for a triple bindrune: rendering **hum**, **hem** or **hee**, **hue**. I consider this not very likely, though, and propose to read **he**. The ultimate rune has an unorthodox form; it is an **e** rune with a horizontal stroke underneath the **e**'s bar, touching the hook, thus rendering something that resembles an **m**:

ᛗ

There is definitely no **t** rune in this sequence, as Krause (1969:155) thought and which led him to an interpretation that cannot be held upright. Also Seebold's (1994ᵃ:75f.) reading: *raþo idon sufnu[h]e, is not correct; the last part is certainly not **nu[h]e**; neither is there **n** nor **u**, but the **h**, on the contrary, is there.

When taking ᛜ to represent **ng**, we read **rango**, *rangō*, Go. nsf. *ōn*-stem. This may be a PN, denoting the female owner of the spindle whorl or a close relative (an interpretation put forward by Krause 1969:157). But, as there may be a second name in the genitive: **adons**, Go. gsf. *ōn*-stem, 'Ado's', I wondered whether *rangō* might denote something else, perhaps the very object, the spindle whorl? That would fit into a well-known type of runic texts that explicitly mentions the object or the material[59].

---

[58] A reading **raþo** (Seebold 1994ᵃ:76) is unlikely, because the 'lantern' is at the top of the headstaff.

[59] For instance: **kobu**, **kabu** 'comb' on a comb (Oostum and Toornwerd, Groningen), **kabr** 'comb' on a comb (Elisenhof, Schleswig-Holstein). Furthermore there is **horn hjartaR** 'deer's horn' on a piece of antler, found in Dublin, and **hronæsban** 'whale's bone' on Franks Casket. The Vimose (Funen) plane has **tal[g]ijo** 'plane'. And there is **kŋia** *kingia* 'brooch' on the Aquincum fibula. Furthermore there is the recently found footstool of Fallward, near the Weser mouth, with the word **ksamella**, NHG *Schemel* 'footstool'.

Unfortunately there are no attests of a *rango* in any Germanic language, but as a spindle whorl has the form of a ring, the nearest parallel to look for would be Crimean Gothic *ringo* 'ring', cf. ON *hringr*, OE, OFris, OS and OHG *hring* < Gmc *\*hrenga-z*. The etymology is unclear, according to Kluge/Seebold (1989:601). Pokorny (1959:936) postulates IE *\*krengh-* 'circle, belt'; Old Church Slavonic has *krǫgъ* < *\*(s)krong(h)-*`circle' (Trubačev 1987:25-27). Therefore, *rango* and Crimean Gothic *ringo* may reflect the frequent IE Ablaut *e ~ o* (Gmc *e ~ a*, before nasal + consonant *i ~ a*).

In Gothic, one would expect *\*hring-s* (spelled as *\*hriggs)*, but it is not attested in biblical Gothic. Apparently the *h* has been lost in initial position before consonants, as is seen in Crimean Gothic *ringo*. Yet the fourth century may be a little early for the loss of initial *h*, although this might be due to an already weakened articulation.

When reading **rango adons**, this might mean: 'ring, (e.g. spindle whorl') (possession) of Ado'.

However, when taking the lantern-shaped rune for **w**, we get **rawo**. OHG has *rāwa* 'rest, peace, place to rest'; in other words 'a grave'. That would be interesting, as the spindle whorl was a gravegift. Thus we obtain a sentence like **rawo adon sufhe:** in which **adon** is a PN, dsf. Go. *ōn*-stem 'for Ado'. Although the language of the inscription is most likely to be Gothic (cf. also Grønvik 1985:171), it cannot definitely be excluded that South Germanic speaking persons were present in South-East Europe in the fourth century. As regards **adon**, an OHG dative sg. weak feminine ending *-on* is attested, but quite seldom (Braune/Eggers 1975:205). Concerning **sufhe** I propose, inspired by Seebold (1994ᵃ:76), 3 sg. optative *sufhē* of the verb *\*sufa-* 'to sleep', cf. Modern Swedish *sova*[60]. When connecting this verbform in the meaning 'may (she) sleep' with the reading **rawo** *rāwo* dsf. *ō*-stem, 'for the restingplace' of the upper part of the inscription, I obtain a semantically acceptable phrase. This includes a runic liberty: one rune is enough for reading twice the same letter. The sequence of the text would then be: **rawo adon(s) sufhe:** 'for the restingplace of Ado, may (she) sleep', which would be a sort of RIP dedication.

However, one would expect an East Germanic dialect being spoken in this Gothic area, and my above interpretation of *rāwo* is according to a South Germanic (Pre-OHG) coloured dialect. Gothic has no long *ā*, except *āh* < Gmc *\*aŋh*, e.g. *fāhan*, and in loanwords. If we should keep to East Germanic, another solution is wanted. Krause took his refuge in a somewhat artificial solution - but worth trying. In runic inscriptions it appears to be allowed to transliterate beyond any divisions in the text. In doing this, one may take the initial **r** from the upper part of the object's inscription and consider this to belong to the text of the lower part - Krause (1969:157) read thus **her** Go 'here'. When reconstructing our runic scribe's cosmetic move[61], we obtain **awo :adons uf her**.

**awo** is Go. *awō* 'grandmother'. **uf** is Go. prep. + dative/acc. 'under'. The whole sentence is then: 'grandmother of Ado (is) under here', e.g. in her grave.

When returning to the first reading **rango : adons uf he**, the same cosmetic move can be carried out, *plus* admitting for another runic feature: the same letter needs not to be written

---

[60] Seebold proposes to read **sufnu(h)e**, with **(h)** as *Hiattrenner*, referring to Gmc *\*suf-nō-*, ON *sofna*, an inchoative verb: 'to go to sleep', but a sequence **-nu-** is not there.

[61] There is a parallel though: the inscription from *Fallward* (Continental Corpus), reading **ksamella lguskaþi** = *skamella [a]lguskaþi* 'footstool (depicting) Elkhunter'. The initial *a* of *[a]lguskaþi* must be borrowed from the ultimate rune of *skamella*. The requested 'cosmetic movement' in the Leţcani inscription is herewith not an isolated feature.

twice. We may then read **rango : adons uf he(r)**, which means 'Ado's ring (= spindle whorl) (is) down here'. The purport of the inscription is expressed with reference to the object as a gravegift: *down here*. The object and the inscription may have been made especially for Ado's afterlife, and subsequently been deposited with her in her grave.

36. *Szabadbattyán* (Hungary). Dated first half 5th c.
The inscription is on the back of a silver buckle. The front is decorated after an antique ornamental style (description and photograph in Krause 1966). The inscription may be read **marings** = *marings*, nsm. *a*-stem.

ᛗᚨᚱᛜᛊ

The ᛜ rune is transliterated **ing** in **marings**, and has a similar lanternshape as in, e.g., *Leţcani* and *Køng*. Antonsen (1975:74) transliterates **marings**, "Marings [i.e. descendent of Mar(h)s; or: horseman]" and considers the language East Gmc. (*Thorsberg* has **mariz**). Krause (1966:-311) interprets: *marings < *marhings* "Kurzform zu Namen mit *marha-* 'Pferd'", presenting a short *a*, thus producing a Gothic PN, nsm. *a*-stem, 'Horseman'. Since runes do not show vowel length, one may read *māring-s* with long *ā*, which would present some Germanic dialect other than Gothic, e.g. Langobardic. This, however, is not very likely (see below). I agree with Antonsen that the symbol that accompanies the inscription is a malformed swastika and no **d** rune. I prefer to interpret the inscription as Gothic, because this is most plausible in view of the combination findplace, decoration and the ending -*s*.
In my opinion, **marings** is another instance of a tribal name, namely of an East Gothic tribe. It can be connected with the text on the Rök stone: **skati marika** *skati mæringa* 'the first among the Mærings', e.g. King Theodoric. The text is part of the so-called "Theodoricstrophe" on the Rök stone (Östergötland, Sweden, dated appr. 9th c.; for a description and pictures, see Jansson 1987). The word *Mæringa* denotes the royal house of Theodoric, and might have been constructed after a personal name with the element *mār, mēr*, and a suffic -*ing*, such as can be found in the names of Theodoric's father *Theodomērs*, and his brothers *Walamērs* and *Widumērs*.

37. *Pietroassa* (Rumania). Dated first half 5th c., according to the text in the Catalogue of the exhibition *Goldhelm* (1994:230). The inscription is on a gold neckring, which has been cut right through the middle of the inscription, so the rune that was there is badly damaged or has disappeared. The runes read **gutani?wihailag**.

ᚷᚢᛏᚨᚾᛁ ᚹᛁ ᚺᚨᛁᛚᚷ

A lot of guesswork about which rune has vanished has been done; see a recent list by Nedoma (1991-93). A new reading and interpretation has been put forward by Reichert (1991-93). I studied the object myself in April 1994, in the *Schirn Kunsthalle* at Frankfurt am Main, where the object was part of the exhibition *Goldhelm* in the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte. If only one rune was lost when the neckring was cut, in my opinion that rune may have been an **s** or **j**. The upper part is still visible left of the cut. To the right of the cut it seems as if also a part of a rune can be distinguished, but I think this is damage, a scratch, maybe made by the cutter.

96

*The two pieces of the neckring of Pietroassa.*

These traces have been interpreted as the remains of an ⋈ (*\*ōđilaz)* rune, but this cannot be correct (cf. Reichert). As there obviously is the little hook on the left side, one may choose between the runes **s** or **j** (Reichert prefers to read **j**). In both readings, the lower part of the rune, which in either way should have had the form of a hook, is lost. Both **gutanis wi hailag** or **gutani j wihailag** may offer something meaningful.

When choosing the last reading, one must consider the **j** rune as a *Begriffsrune* for *\*jēra* 'good year, harvest' (cf. *Stentoften*, below, nr. 42), also Reichert's interpretation (1991-93:239), who comments: "in wulfilanischer Orthographie (...): *gutane jer weih hailag*".
As to the reading of **gutanis**, I suggest to consider to take this as *gutaneis* 'Gothic', adj. nominative sg. masculine **wi[h]** may be taken as Go. *weih* nsn. 'sanctuary'; **hailag** adj. 'holy'. The inscription therefore may be interpreted: 'Gothic (object). Sacrosanct'.


5. PERIOD II, Monumental inscriptions on stone: the Blekinge inscriptions.

38-41. *Björketorp, Gummarp, Istaby,* and *Stentoften* (Blekinge, Sweden).
Most handbooks treat these four inscriptions on stone together, since their texts seem to have had a common source, or at least show striking similarities and relations, both semantically and runologically. Sometimes also the SÖLVESBORG stone is included. The stones all were erected in Blekinge in the South East of Sweden, in former times Danish territory. Only the Björketorp stone still stands *in situ* (near Björketorp, Leråkra and Listerby), the other stones have been removed to different places. For elaborate information and references, cf. Birkmann (1995:114-142) and Krause (1966:203-220). My transliteration is based on personal investigation of the stones (except for Gummarp, which has gone lost in the Fire of Copenhagen, 1728). In order to make clear what the mutual similarities in runes and texts look like, to increase interpretability and to provide a comfortable base for interpretation, I present the texts, which have no division marks, divided into words.
The **A** in the transcription represents the open vowel (non-nasalized) *a*, rendered by the former *\*jāra* rune ⋌, which had changed its name into *\*āra*, due to the Proto Norse loss of initial *j*. Björketorp and Gummarp both contain exclusively **A** runes, independent of the quality of the vowel; they have no *\*ansuz* runes. Stentoften and Istaby both contain *\*ansuz* and **A**, Istaby shows the latter in a different form: ⊦ , though.
The *\*ansuz* rune (there is only one) in Stentoften represents a nasalized *ã*. The *\*ansuz* runes in Istaby render unstressed *a*; the distinction of **A** and **a** in Istaby expresses the opposition stressed - unstressed. The **a**-runes in Istaby denote svarabhakti vowels and two times *a* in unstressed syllables.

For the use of **z** denoting an *r* < Gmc *r* in **Afatz** (Istaby) and **hAidz** (Björketorp) see Antonsen (1975:17): "The reverse spellings (...) indicate that PG */r/ (originally a uvular trill) and PG */z/ have coalesced in an apical trill after apicals".

38. *Björketorp*, a composition of three monoliths. Huge *bauta* stones like these are known in Scandinavia from prehistoric times onwards, and were probably used as grave-monuments. It is impossible to say whether this was the case with these three monoliths. Only one stone of the Björketorp monument, the middle one, bears a runic inscription. When walking around the monolith, it appears that the text on the back (Side B) immediately joins that part of the text of Side A, that starts with **utiAz**. I suppose this is no coincidence. The sequence from top to bottom runs thus:

Side A: **sAz þAt bArutz**
Side B: **uþArAbA sbA**  Side A: **utiAz welAdAude**
**hAerAmA lAusz**
**inArunAz ArAgeu**
**fAlAh Ak hA[i]derAg**
**hAidz runoronu**

ᚼᚨᚤᛈᛁᛏᛒᛁᚱᚢᛏᚤ
ᚢᛈᛁᚱᛁᛒᛙᛋᛒᛁ   ᚢᛏᛁᚨᛁᚠᛗᚠᛁᛗᛁᚢᛙᛙ
ᚼᛁᛗᚱᛁᛗᛁᛏᚢᚤ
ᛁᛁᚱᚢᚾᛁᚤᛁᚱᛁᚷᛙᚢ
ᚠᛁᚨᚼᛁᚤᚼᛁᛙᛙᚱᛁᚷ
ᚼᛁᛁᛙᚤᚱᚢᛏᛟᚱᛟᛏᚢ

Moltke (1985:142) read the text starting from the bottom line up, which makes sense, because it turns out that the **g** at the end of **hAiderAg** actually belongs to **[g]inArunAz** at the beginning of the third line from below.
I guess the text actually is a poem:

> haidz rūnōrōnū    falah ak haidera
> (ra)ginarūnāz    arageu haeramalausz
> ūþaraba spā      ūtiaz wēladaude
> saz þat barutz

**hAidz** *haiđz*, cf. Gmc *\*haiđra-* 'clear, shining, bright', ON *heiđr*.
**runoronu**, consisting of *rūnō-* 'rune-', using *-ō-* for connective vowel (Antonsen 1975:19), and *-rōnū < \*rōnōn* or *\*runōn* 'row, sequence', asf. *ōn*-stem (Krause 1971:52; Antonsen 1975:87f.).
**fAlAh Ak** with svarabhakti second **A** in **fAlAh** *falh ak* 1 sg. pret. ind. 'I buried', cf. ON *fela*, Gmc *\*felhan* 'to hide, to bury', here probably meant to render the act of carving runes into the stone surface. It is remarkable, that the first person singular is expressed twice: in the verbform and in the pers. pronoun. I suppose this is done when the inscription, besides the oblique verbform, also contains the name of the one who emphasizes himself as 'I', like e.g.

in *Gallehus*, *Lindholm*, RÖ, TUNE, KJÖLEVIK, NOLEBY, JÄRSBERG, EIKELAND, *Seeland (II)*-C bracteate. The name or epithet referred to in this inscription may be **hAerAmAlAusz**, see below.

**Ak** pers. pron. 1 sg. 'I'.

**hA[i]derAginArunAz** *haidera ginarūnāz*, in which *haidera* (with svarabhakti **e)** means 'here', cf. ON *heđra. gi(n)na-* is an adj. meaning 'wide', cf. the Eddic *gap var ginnunga* (Voluspá 3) 'wide crevice'; OE *ginn* 'wide, spacious', and the ON verb *gina* 'to yawn'. *rūnāz* apf. *ō*-stem 'runes', which can be taken to denote the whole inscription. Together this means: 'here wide(-cut) runes'. I suggest to take the text with the middle sequence **rA** double, in order to obtain alliteration in *[ra]ginarunaz*. The meaning may be: 'the message, determined by fate', cf. *ragina*, cf. Go. *ragin* 'counsel', OS *regan-, regino-,* OE *regn* 'determined by fate', ON *regin, rǫgn* 'ruling gods' (Antonsen, 1975:55). See also NOLEBY **raginakudo** and Hávamál 80: *regin-kunnom* dpf. '[runes], coming from the gods'. This interpretation 'determined by fate' would not seem farfetched, regarding the purport of the rest of the text.

**ArAgeu**, with svarabhakti second **A**: *argeu*, dsf. *jōn*-stem, < *\*argijōn* (Krause 1991:119), ON *argr* < *\*argaz* 'cowardly', 'unmanly', 'performing sorcery', 'showing indecent behaviour'; OHG *ar(a)g*, OE *earg* 'cowardly' (Antonsen 1975:86).

**hAerAmAlAusz**, with svarabhakti second **A**: *haerma-* < *\*herma-* 'rest' (Krause 1971:61); *-lausz* < *\*lausaz*, ON *lauss* 'without', adj. *a*-stem, see above *Vimose* nr. 11. The meaning may be 'restless'; Antonsen (1975:86) suggests 'protectionless'.

*haeramalaus(a)z* can be a PN or epithet, *a*-stem, stemvowel lost, an occurrence of syncope. I suggest this 'Restless' identical with the 'I' from **fAlAh Ak**, who carved the runes.

The spelling *-ae-* in *haeramalausz* denotes the product of breaking *e > ae*; cf. also *haeruw-ulafiz* in *Istaby* (see below).

Side B: **uþArAbA** is usually connected with something unfavorite, something bad. The word probably consists of the negative particle *ū-* and *þarba = þarfa,* cf. the ON verb *þurfa* 'to require, to need'; *þarf* impers. 'it is necessary'; as a substantive ON *þǫrf*, cf. Gmc *\*þarbō-*, 'want, need, necessity'. *ūþarba* might mean 'something unwanted'. The second **A** is a svarabhakti vowel.

**sbA**, cf. ON *spá* f. 'prophecy' or 1 sg. pres. ind. 'I foresee', ON inf. *spá*. In this case I prefer the last interpretation, since it can be connected with the former mentioned 'I' (who carved the runes, and who also might be called 'Restless'). Thus the text gets more coherence.

**utiAz**, cf. ON *útar* adv. comp. 'farther away, to the south'.

**welAdAude**, compound, consisting of: *wēl-*, cf. ON *vél* f. 'treachery, trick'; the *-a-* is the connective vowel in the compound; and: *-dauđē*, dsm. *a*-stem, of *\*dauđa-* 'death': together this means: 'a death by treachery'. The second **d** of **dAude** renders *đ*, product of voicing *þ > đ* between vowels.

**sAz**, ON *sá* dem. pron. nsm. 'he, who', *sa -z < \*-ez* is the relative particle 'he who, which' (Antonsen 1975:88).

**þAt**, ON *þat* dem. pron. asn. 'this'.

**bArutz**, *barut(i)z* 3 sg. pres. ind. with the ending of the 2nd sg.; cf. ON *brýtr* 'breaks'. The **A** in *barutz* is a svarabhakti vowel.

The text as a whole runs thus:

'A clear runerow I, Restless, buried (dug, carved) here, wide (divine) runes (or a fate-predicted message), I foresee bad things: because of cowardly behaviour a death by treachery far away; he who breaks this'. The demonstrative pronoun 'this' has been presumed as referring to the monument itself, but I do not think this likely. The most significant part of the

text is, in my opinion, 'somebody will die of treachery'. This would happen in case somebody cowardly breaks 'this', which might regard a treaty or a an agreement, possibly made by three persons, which is symbolised by the three standing stones. It is tempting to suggest that these three persons might be Haþuwolf, Haeruwolf and Hariwolf, and that the three staves **fff** from the *Gummarp* inscription (see below) symbolize their agreement, concerning livestock (the name of the rune **f** means 'cattle') or other (mutual?) precious possessions. Even an offering has been carried out, in order to obtain prosperity (Stentoften). The four runic monuments might have been erected to indicate the borders of their property: Gammaltorps socken, Mjällby socken and Listerby socken (see Jacobsen & Moltke 1942:399-413).

39. *Gummarp*, lost, but there exists a drawing by Skonvig (1627), published in *Danmarks Runeindskrifter* (Jacobsen/Moltke 1941/42).
(***h***)**AþuwolAfA sAte stAbA þria fff**  'Haþuwolafa[z?] cut three staves **fff**'.

ᚺᛁᚦᚢᚹᛟᛚᚨᚠᚨ
ᛋ ᚨᛏᛗ
ᛋᛏᚨᛒᚨᚦᚱᛁᚠ   ᚠᚠᚠ

According to Jacobsen & Moltke (1941/42:406) the inscription provides the possibility of different interpretations. It appears that (***h***)**AþuwolAfA** either misses its nominative ending *-z* (but compare **laguþewa**, *Illerup* III), or is in the accusative, in which case the inscription would be incomplete, since a subject is lacking. One may interpret the legend thus: '(In memory of) Haþuwolafa (somebody) cut three staves **fff**'.
**sAte** *sattē* 3 sg. pret. ind. of a verb like Go. *satjan* and ON *setja* 'to set', Gmc *\*satjan* 'to set'.
**stAbA** *staba* apm. *a*-stem 'staves', e.g. runes.
**þria** apm. *ja*-stem, 'three'.
**fff** are mostly conjectured to represent three *Begriffsrunen*, indicating the rune name for **f** *\*fehu* 'livestock, wealth'.
I think Haþuwolafa is not in the nominative, since then he would be the runecarver of this inscription. This does not seem likely, since he certainly was the runecarver of *Istaby*, below. The point is that there another stock of runes has been used, which definitely points to two different runecarvers.

40. *Istaby*, in Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm.
Side A: **Afatz hAriwulafa hAþuwulafz hAeruwulafiz**
Side B: **warAit runAz þAiAz**

ᛋᚠᚨᛏᚨᛉᚺᛋᚱᛁᚹᚢᛚᚠᚠ
ᚺᛋᚦᚢᛒᚢᛚᚠᚠᛉᚺᛋᛖᚱᚢᛒᚢᛚᚠᚠᛁᛉ
ᚹᚨᚱᛋᛁᛏᚱᚢᛏᛋᛦᚦᛋᛁᛋᛦ

As has been mentioned above, the form of the rune denoting **A**: ᛋ is actually that of the *\*jāra* rune that elsewhere denotes **j**. It is remarkable that the runecarver used here this graph to denote about the same sound as the one that has been rendered by ᚨ , transliterated **A,** in the

other Blekinge inscriptions. Besides, he used the *ansuz* ᚠ rune in all three **wulaf** nameparts, to represent a svarabhakti vowel or in an unstressed ending, such as in **-wulafa**.

It may be, that in the name **hAeruwulafiz** the pronunciation of **A** was palatal, considering the development of the breaking of *e > ea > ja > jǫ* by *u*-mutation; rendering the later attested ON name *Hjǫrólfr*, and *Hjōrulf*.

**Afatz** is misspelled for *aftaz = aftar* 'to the memory of', 'for'. According to Antonsen (1975:8 4) "with neutralization of contrast *z ≠ r* after apicals".

**hAriwulafa** *Hariwulafa* PN asm. *a*-stem. The name consists of *Hari-* 'warrior', m., and -*wulafa* asm. *a*-stem, cf. Gmc *wulfaz*, 'wulf', a name-element all three names in this inscription share.

**haþuwulafz** PN nsm. *a*-stem, subject. The second element *-wulafz* shows syncope of the stemvowel. The first element of the name, *Haþu-* 'battle', is a nominative *u*-stem. A parallel case is the OHG *Hildebrandslied,* where two relatives with a common second name-element, preceded by *heri* resp. *hadu* occur: *Heribrant* and *Hadubrant*, Hildebrand's father and son.

**hAeruwulafiz** is presumably the patronymic with the ending *īz < *-ijaz*; the first name-element is *haeru-* , cf. ON *hjǫrr* 'sword', Gmc *heru-*, Go. *hairus*.

**warAit** 'wrait' 3 sg. pret. ind. 'wrote', inf. Gmc *wrītan* 'to carve, to write'. The **a** is again a svarabhakti.

**runAz** *rūnāz* apf. *ō*-stem, 'runes'; similar spelling in *Björketorp*, different in *Stentoften*.

**þAiAz** *þa-iāz* demonstrative pron. apf. 'these' (Antonsen 1975:84).

'Haþuwulf, son of Haeruwulf, wrote to the memory of Hariwulf these runes'.


41. *Stentoften*, in the church of Sölvesborg.

**niu hAborumz niu hagestumz hAþuwolAfz gAf j hAriwolAfz mA??usnuh?e hidez runono felAh ekA hederA [rA]ginoronoz herAmAlAsAz ArAgeu welAdud sA þAt bAriutiþ**

ᚺᛁᚢᚺᛁᛒᛟᚱᚢᛗᛉ
ᚺᛁᚢᚺᚠᚷᛖᛏᚢᛗᛉ
ᚺᛪᚦᚢᚱᛟᛚᚹ ᛣᚷᚠ    ᛋ
ᚺᛦᚱᛁᛟᛚᚹ ᛣᛗᛪ    ᛚᛋᛏᚢᚺ ᛖ
ᚺᛁᛞᛖᛉᚱᚢᚾᛟᛏᛟᚱᚹᛗᛏᚺᛗᚤᛪᚺᛗᛒᛗᚱᛪᚷᛁᛋᛟᚱᛟᛏᛟᛉ
ᚺᛖᚱᛪᛗᛪᛚᛋᛪᛦᚱᛪᚷᛗᚢᚹᛗᛪᛗᛚᛋᚢᚦᛪᛏᛒᛪᚱᛁᚢᛏᛁᚦ


For an elaborate account of a variety of interpretations, proposed by different scholars, I refer to Birkmann (1995:125-137). As regards reading and interpretation of the first part of the text, I prefer the ingenious solution published by Santesson (1989:221-229). The inscription starts with what looks like a chant, maybe a spell. The rest of the text, from **hidez** onward, is almost similar to Björketorp, only the spelling of some words differs.

Santesson's reading and interpretation of the initial part of the text is entirely based on the phonological differences displayed by the runes for **A** (open *a*) and **a** (nasalised *ã*) in: *niu hAborumz, niu hãgestumz*. She takes *niu* to mean 'nine'. The *-o-* in *hAborumz* is a svarabhakti vowel; the ending *-umz* is dative plural *a*-stem. Santesson postulates Gmc *habraz* 'bock', ON *hafr*, Latin *caper*. In **hagestumz** she grasps the possibility of taking the *ansuz* rune **a** for

representing nasalized *ã* in order to reconstruct *hangestumz*, which she assumes to be a dative plural 'with (nine) steeds'; the nominative sg. then would be *\*hangistaz* < Gmc *\*hanhistaz*, with reference to Verner's law, cf. ON *hestr* < *\*hanhistaz*. The use of an **e** rune to denote an *i* sound of *hangistumz* seems to be a peculiarity of the Blekinge inscriptions. The other words that show this are: **hidez** = *h(a)idir* and **arageu** = *aragiu* (Santesson 1989:226).

**hAþuwolAfz** *Haþuwolafz*, cf. Istaby: **hAþuwolafz**, nsm. *a*-stem. Of course the Stentoften carver had to use **A** in **-wolAfz**, since an **a** would render a nasalized *ã*, and that would not be adequate here.

**gAf** *gaf* 3 sg. pret. ind., cf. the ON verb *gefa* 'to give'.

The sentence is then: 'With nine he-goats, with nine steeds, Haþuwolafz gave **j**' = *\*jāra*, *\*jēra* which is the rune's name, here used as *pars pro toto* for its intrinsic meaning 'a good year = a fruitful harvest' (cf. *Skodborghus-B*, nr. 37, Bracteates Corpus). This obviously refers to some offering to obtain prosperity, although the phrase 'gave' seems strange from the mouth of the sacrifizer. Does this mean that he gave a part of his harvest = the offering of eighteen animals? The repetitive offering of nine male animals is well-known from medieval Uppsala, described by Adam of Bremen.

The text continues with:

**hAriwolAfz**, PN nsm. *a*-stem; compare *Istaby* **hAriwulafa**. The vowels **o** and **u** interchange in the 'wolf/wulf'-names in Gummarp, Istaby and Stentoften. Contrarious to Björketorp the name of the rune-carver might be mentioned here: *Hariwolafz*.

The part between **hAriwolAfz** and **hidez** is illegible to me (but see Birkmann 1995:125ff.).

**hidez** cf. *Björketorp* **hAidz** 'clear, bright'.

**runono** cf. *Björketorp* **runoronu**, the carver omitted a syllable. The ending of *rūnō[rō]nō* differs from the ending *-ū* in Björketorp, both derived from Gmc *\*rōnōn, \*rūnōn* 'row, sequence'.

**felAh ekA**, 1 sg. pres. ind., Björketorp **fAlAh Ak** 1 sg. pret. ind., inf.: Gmc *\*felhan*, ON *fela* 'to bury, to hide', e.g. 'to carve'.

**ekA** = *Björketorp* **Ak**, 1 sg. enclitic pronoun 'I', cf. **hateka** in *Lindholm*. The person pronoun **ek** < Gmc. *\*ek, \*ekan* is attested in, for instance, *Gårdlösa* **ek unwodz**.

**hederA** cf. *Björketorp* **hAiderA**, cf. ON *heđra,* 'here'.

**[rA]ginoronoz** and *Björketorp* **[rA]ginArunAz** show variation in *-rōnōz* against *-rūnāz* and *ginA* against *gino*, which may be due to different dialects (on the forms, see Antonsen 1975:19f.). Orthographic differences between *Stentoften* and *Björketorp* can also be observed in some other features: *i* ∼ *ai, e* ∼ *ai, e* ∼ *a*.

**herAmAlAsAz** cf. *Björketorp* **hAerAmAlAusz**, which may depict a slight difference in pronunciation, or a difference in spelling skills.

**ArAgeu** cf. *Björketorp* **ArAgeu**.

**welAdud** cf. *Björketorp* **welAdAude**.

**sA** nsm. dem. pronoun *sá* 'he'.

**þAt** cf. **þAt** 'this'.

**bAriutiþ** cf. *Björketorp* **bArutz**, which actually is the ending of the 2 sg. pres. ind.; the 3 sg. pres. ind. ending *-iþ* is correctly spelled in *Stentoften*.

The text can be interpreted thus: 'With nine he-goats, with nine steeds, Haþuwolafz gave **j**. Hariwolafz (something illegible) a clear runerow I (e.g. Hariwolafz?) bury (carve) here, wide (divine) runes (or a fate-predicting message); restless because of cowardly behaviour, a death by treachery, he (who) destroys this'.

102

# 6. Summary and Conclusions

Period I has a total of 36 runic objects, represented as 34 entries; there are 3 objects from South-East Europe (or 4, if Kowel is included). Period II counts 4 items (the Blekinge stones). Although listed as one number in the Catalogue, some entries consist of more than one object, such as the lanceheads from Illerup and the arrows from Nydam.

Material: Period I:
**metal:** 25; bronze: 6, silver: 11, gold: 2; iron: 4.
**other than metal**: 12; wood: 9, bone/antler: 4.
Material Period II:
**stone**: 4.

Period I, Denmark: 25 texts are legible, 9 are not legible or interpretable. 15 inscriptions show only one word, mostly a name. 5 inscriptions consist of two words; 7 inscriptions consist of more than two words. I have counted 20 men's names, of which at least half may be West Gmc. In a few cases women's names may occur (**leþro**, **witro**) but these names are probably also West Gmc masculine names. 6 times the object itself is referred to. Furthermore there are 10 verbforms. There are 10 sentences.

Names on bog-finds are sometimes accompanied by a verbform: **tawide** (twice), **_wi_hgu, ahti** (?), **ha, haite, hateka** 'made', 'fight (consecrate)', 'owned', 'have', 'am called' (twice). The brooches (gravefinds) bear names and twice a verbform **talgida, talgidai** 'carved, cut'. The two stray finds of 400-550 bear names and one verbform: **tawido** 'made'. Some objects are explicitly mentioned, also metaphorically: **wagagastiz sikijaz** 'flameguest coming from a bog' = the iron axe; **rango** 'ring' = spindle whorl; **makija** 'sword' = many swords; **talijo** 'plane'.
4 times **ek** 'I' is used. 5 times **alu** and once **auwija** may point to some 'formulaic' use of well-wishes.

Bog-deposits form the largest find-category of the 'Danish' Corpus. The depositioning of large (weapon)deposits appears to have stopped at around 400. The next category of objects with runes are the bracteates (late 5th c. - early 6th c., with one exception of the 4th c.). Bracteates were also deposited in bogs, or buried as hoards, or given as gravegoods. The war-booty deposited there was apparently replaced by the depositing of symbolic, possibly cultic objects. One may wonder if these two categories (the war-booty and the bracteates) are in some way connected[62], e.g. as concerns the ideology that may have existed behind the custom of depositing. At any rate both categories belonged to a male warriors' society. The runic gravegoods on the other hand can nearly always be associated with women.

The Illerup bog provided 9 runic objects; the Vimose bog 6 objects; the Nydam bog 4 objects, the Kragehul bog 2 objects (the two objects from the Thorsberg bog are listed among

---

[62] The recent publication of Bazelman's dissertation (1996) opens up a vista on a possible use of bracteates in a warriors' cult, especially among the young retainers at a royal court. The coming of age, or the introduction of young men into the warriors' society, the *comitatus*, may have been accompanied by some special rites, crowned by an inauguration and the confirmation thereof by way of a bracteate.

the Continental Corpus). Garbølle and Lindholm produced 2 more bog-finds. From graves 8 objects are recorded. 4 objects are stray finds. The total number of bog-finds is 25 objects (including the Thorsberg items). It is remarkable that bog-finds should only occur on former Danish territory (including Schleswig-Holstein and Skåne), although hardly any bog-finds are recorded from Sealand. This may be so, because bogs were not available everywhere; in other regions people will have offered runic objects, too, but probably in other wetlands, like lakes and rivers. These objects will be much more difficult to retrieve. Many runic objects were found while digging for peat in the former bogs, as can be observed from the Bracteate Corpus. Objects that were deposited in rivers etc. almost only come to light as a result of dredging activities.

The bog-finds are men's ware: weapons, weapon parts, personal equipment, a comb, an amulet, tools. The gravefinds are women's objects. The stray finds are made of gold; they may have been hidden hoards. The straight division of runic objects that were found in either bogs or graves is remarkable. No men's graves are known that contained runic objects and in the bogs no runic women's objects have been found. The provenance of the objects turns out to be in defiance of the linguistic character of the runic texts, especially in the case of the Vimose, Illerup and Thorsberg finds. The Illerup and Vimose finds were nearly all made in Scandinavia or Denmark, but the inscriptions show West Gmc linguistic features. The Thorsberg finds were probably manufactured in a West Gmc area, but the inscriptions show North- or North West Gmc linguistic features. The oldest runic object, the **harja** comb, appears to come from North-West Poland, but the name is probably West Gmc.

The question is whether it is possible to mark clear dialectical boundaries in runic usage and link archaeological and linguistic data (cf. also Stoklund 1994:106f.). In accordance with the provenance of the oldest runic objects, from the Rhine-Weser area to Poland to the Kattegat area and even stretching as far as North of Oslo, runic knowledge was extended over an astonishingly large area. This can only be explained by assuming that individuals, tribes and groups travelled around a lot during the first few centuries of our era. The oldest known runic objects can be associated with war and the accumulation of wealth and power. Both had to do with relations between certain families (belonging to a military elite), and also between the Germanic elite and high-placed people within the Roman empire.

Period I, South-East Europe: 4 inscriptions (including KOWEL, see introduction to this chapter), all are legible. Two inscriptions contain more than two words (the Pietroassa neckring and the Leţcani spindle whorl), two display one word (KOWEL and the Szabad-battyán brooch). One woman's name, one man's name, an object's name **rango**, and a verbform **sufhe** occur. Perhaps **tilarids** on the Kowel spearhead is to be understood as the weapon's name. There is one sentence. Two texts were obviously made for special occasions, such as a burial and a sanctuary (which may have been the reason they were retained). The inscription on the brooch, bearing a name, belongs to a wide-spread text-type, as does the inscription on the spindle whorl, both denoting the objects itself.
**Material**: gold: 1; silver: 1; iron: 1; earthenware: 1.

Period II.  Only the four Blekinge stones are discussed, bearing relatively long or very long texts, which were cut in big stones with large runes, clearly legible. A quite different runic tradition appears to have emerged during an unknown lapse of time following the epoch of the archaic inscriptions and the bracteates. One is tempted to suppose the existence of an elaborate runic tradition already during the archaic period, although no other contemporary inscriptions that are comparable to the Blekinge ones have turned up yet (at least not from the

areas that were investigated for this project). The Blekinge inscriptions are especially interesting because of their peculiar use of runes. According to the runic stock, the inscriptions belong to the assumed transitory stage from the older 24-letter alphabet to the newer Scandinavian 16-letter *fuþork*. The other remarkable fact is that the texts were written on huge stone memorials, a practice that differs from the older runic practices of writing runes on small, precious objects, such as is known from the early Danish, Continental, English and Dutch inscriptions.

There can be no doubt that the men, mentioned by their names on the four Blekinge stones, are related. The fact that the names show some variety in spelling, may be due to several factors, such as dialectal or phonological differences (e.g. a slightly different pronunciation). Stentoften might be older than Björketorp. But in my opinion the interval cannot be very large, maybe one generation, or two, which might be indicated by the three names of son, father and grandfather.

Name-forms denoting the same person are *Haþuwolafz* on Istaby and Stentoften, and *Haþuwolafa* on Gummarp. *Hariwulafa = Hariwolafz* on Istaby and Stentoften. Together with *Haeruwulafiz* (Istaby) these persons apparently belong to one family or clan, because of the similarity of the second part of the names and the alliterating first part. Besides, they refer to each other in the texts. At any rate *Haþuwulafz* was the active runecarver of Istaby, he gave **j** on Stentoften, and he was commemorated on Gummarp. This creates the impression that he was an important person. None of these names appears in Björketorp, although I wonder whether the postulated epithet *Haeramalausz* may be that of one of the 'wolves', like *Haeruwulafiz*, for instance, because of the alliteration. The first name-element contains **A** in all names, the endings vary: **A** in Gummarp and Stentoften; **a** in Istaby. The use of a special rune

ᚼ in the initial syllable may have something to do with the emphasis that is put on the first syllable, and with the alliteration. One question remains: why did the runecarver of Istaby use

another runic graph for **A**, namely ᚺ , whereas on the other stones ᚼ has been used for **A**. It may be that *Hariwolafz* was the carver of Stentoften. He either used the Björketorp text as example, or he was the author of this text too.

The Blekinge runecarvers applied three different forms of the *\*jāra/āra* rune. The ancient **j** rune in Stentoften symbolizes its name: *\*jāra* 'good year', and it is realized in an old-fashioned form: ᛃ , which was probably done in order to avoid confusion with the rune denoting **A**

ᚼ . Obviously a distinction was made between the mnemonical use of runenames, being a tool that enabled carvers to determine which sound a runic symbol had, and the meaning and use of symbolic runes, used as *pars pro toto* for some special purpose.

It looks as if two separate developments can be detected in the Blekinge inscriptions. The differences are between the Björketorp, Stentoften and Gummarp group on the one hand, all using ᚼ to denote non-nasal **A**, and the Istaby inscription, using ᚺ to denote **A** in contrast to svarabhakti and unstressed ᛁ.

The graph ᚼ **A** occurs more frequently in Scandinavian inscriptions, as can be seen on the map in Derolez (1987:59). The rune lived on in Scandinavia, but at some later time it became to render **h**.

The graph ᚼ **j** occurs in Scandinavia in NOLEBY **tojeka** only, but it occurs relatively often in England and Frisia, denoting **j**.

The graph ᚺ **j** occurs on the Continent, in *Charnay, Bezenye* and *Oettingen*. It clearly shows

its graphic relation with the presumed original rune for **j** ᛃ . Such a graphic relation cannot easily be seen between ᛃ and ᛃ . Since *\*jāra > āra*, both ᛃ and ᚼ could render oral *a*, but ᚼ did this in Istaby only (as far as I know).

**p** also disappeared from the runic alphabet at this stage. The sound *p* is represented by **b** in **sba** *spá*. Thus the Björketorp inscription shows some stage in the process of the reduction of the 24-letter *fuþark*.

The enigmatic **niuhagestumz** (Santesson: *niu ha(n)gestumz* 'with nine steeds') was formerly interpreted as 'nine guests': *niuha gestumz* (cf. Krause 1966:212), showing *i*-mutation in *gest- < \*gastiz*. In Santesson's solution there is no trace of *i*-mutation. Syncope, though, does occur in several words.

The greatest surprise is that in the Blekinge inscriptions we suddenly find *literature* in runes, which leads to the conclusion that at some time in runic history people started to use runes for other purposes than inscribing names on special objects. Just like any other script runes could be used to write literary and memorial texts. This is all the more interesting, as the Blekinge inscriptions clearly point to the existence of a powerful family, who openly manifested their convictions by way of these audacious texts on huge stones.